

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/5/09 has been entered.

It is noted that claims 5-14 directed to a species (see Fig. 5) other than the species of claims 1-2 (see Fig. 1) and these claims should have been an subject to a restriction/election requirements, however no burden at this time.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama et al (JP 9-321488) alone or in an alternative in view of Maejima (4-125996).

Yokoyama et al discloses the claimed cable/tube installation system for use with a component mounting apparatus, comprising: a movable guide member 5 fixedly mounted to the head perpendicularly to the axis of the head 5; and

a semi-circular stationary guide member 9 mounted in parallel with the movable guide member, wherein the cable is configured to be laid in an arc shape with respect to a plan view and bent back in U shape, the movable guide member configured to fixedly attach the one end of the cable and the stationary guide member configured to fixedly attach the another end of the cable, thereby allowing the arc shape of the cable near both the fixedly attached one end and the fixedly attached another end to have a center of curvature coinciding with the rotation axis of the head, and wherein the movable guide member and the stationary guide member are configured to have a plurality of cables, each bent back in a U shape diameter, arranged in a circumferential direction between the movable guide member and the stationary guide member (see Fig. 1 of the reference). If argues that the Yokoyama et al is lacking of "movable guide and the plurality of cables, each bent back in a U shape diameter, arranged in a circumferential direction between the movable guide member and the stationary guide member" Then applicant s refer to Figs. 1, 7 and 10 for the teaching of cable tube system having the above configurations. Therefore, It would have been an obvious at the time of the invention was made to employ the Maejima's teaching of movable guide member and the U shape cable/tube arranging between the guide members onto the mounting

system of the Yokoyama et al in order to obtain a cable carrier having the above features i.e., movable guide member for laying substantially U shape flat cable/tube.

Limitation of claim 14 is also met by the above discussion (see Yokoyama's Fig. 1).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments have been acknowledged.
4. Claims 1-2 and 5-12 appear to be allowable.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mt  
1/8/10

/Minh Trinh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729